

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the pending application is respectfully requested on the basis of the following particulars.

1. In the claims

As shown in the foregoing LIST OF CURRENT CLAIMS, the claims have been amended to more clearly point out the subject matter for which protection is sought.

Claims 1-14, 18, 27 remain canceled.

Claim 24 is amended to correct a minor informality.

It is respectfully submitted that no new matter is added, since the changes merely correct minor informalities.

Claims 15-17, 19-23, 28-30 are left unchanged.

Entry of the LIST OF CURRENT CLAIMS is respectfully requested in the next Office communication.

2. Rejection of claims 15-17, 20, 22, 24-26, and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent no. 5,755,855 (Baker et al.) in view of U.S. patent no. 3,225,517 (Wachsmuth)

This rejection is rendered moot by the inclusion in amended claims 15 and 24, from which the remaining claims depend, of the indicated allowable subject matter of claims 18 and 27, respectively.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

3. Rejection of claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent no. 5,755,855 (Baker et al.) in view of U.S. patent no. 3,225,517 (Wachsmuth), and further in view of U.S. patent no. 5,048,548 (Ramsey, Jr.)

This rejection is rendered moot by the inclusion in amended claim 15, from which claim 21 depends, of the indicated allowable subject matter of claim 18.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

4. Rejection of claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent no. 5,755,855 (*Baker et al.*) in view of U.S. patent no. 3,225,517 (*Wachsmuth*), and further in view of U.S. patent no. 6,085,549 (*Daus et al.*)

This rejection is rendered moot by the inclusion in amended claim 15, from which claim 23 depends, of the indicated allowable subject matter of claim 18.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

5. Rejection of claims 15 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent no. 5,755,855 (*Baker et al.*) in view of U.S. patent no. 6,865,877 (*Yoshida et al.*)

This rejection is rendered moot by the inclusion in amended claim 15, from which claim 19 depends, of the indicated allowable subject matter of claim 18.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

6. Allowable subject matter

The applicant gratefully acknowledges the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 18, 27, 29, and 30. Accordingly, the subject matter of claims 18 and 27 has been added to independent claims 15 and 24 respectively in the response filed on January 22, 2010.

7. Comments on statement of reasons for allowance

On page 8 of the Office action, the reasons for allowance state that “the compressor has liquid injection at the exit of the compressor.”

It is respectfully submitted that this statement is not entirely accurate.

In particular, while the compressor element does have liquid injection, this injection is not limited to any particular position within the compressor.

Instead, the injected liquid in the compressor is *separated* at the exit in a heated state by a liquid separator, and the heat of the separated liquid is then used to re-heat the gas mixture.

It is believed that, for at least this reason, claims 15 and 24 are patentable in view of the cited prior art.

8. Response to Advisory Action dated February 1, 2010

The Advisory Action dated February 1, 2010 indicates that the amendments to the claims submitted on January 22, 2010 were not entered.

Accordingly, a Request for Continued Examination is concurrently filed herewith, effectively removing the finality of the rejection of the claims, and entry of the amendment to the claims submitted on January 22, 2010 is respectfully requested prior to the entry of the above amendments to the claims.

The action also notes that if the amendments to the claims are entered, claims 16 and 17 would be rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, as being a separate embodiment from reheating by separated liquid as recited in amended claim 15.

It is respectfully submitted that such a rejection of the claims should not be made.

A review of the specification as originally filed finds clear support for the combination of different heating mechanisms, for example, the use of recycled injection liquid and/or heat of the compressed gas and/or the heat of the cooling medium of a cooling circuit (specification page 4, lines 1-6).

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 16 and 17 satisfy all of the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, and that no rejection of these claims under this statute should be made.

9. Conclusion

As a result of the amendment to the claims, and further in view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that every pending claim in the present application be allowed and the application be passed to issue.

Please charge any additional fees required or credit any overpayments in connection with this paper to Deposit Account No. 02-0200.

If any issues remain that may be resolved by a telephone or facsimile communication with the applicant's attorney, the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the numbers shown below.

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC
625 Slaters Lane, Fourth Floor
Alexandria, Virginia 22314-1176
Phone: (703) 683-0500
Facsimile: (703) 683-1080

Date: February 18, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

/Patrick M. Buechner/

PATRICK M. BUECHNER
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 57,504